



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/765,776	01/27/2004	Kris Kobylinski	CA920030062US1	2455
35525	7590	12/27/2007	EXAMINER	
IBM CORP (YA)			VERDI, KIMBLEANN C	
C/O YEE & ASSOCIATES PC				
P.O. BOX 802333			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
DALLAS, TX 75380			2194	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			12/27/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/765,776	KOBYLINSKI ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	KimbleAnn Verdi	2194

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 October 2007.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-28 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-28 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.


WILLIAM T. THOMPSON
PRIMARY PATENT EXAMINER

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

This office action is in response to the Amendment filed on October 17, 2007. Claims 1-28 are pending in the current application. All previously outstanding objections and rejections to the Applicant's disclosure and claims not contained in this Action have been respectfully withdrawn by the Examiner hereto.

Response to Amendment

1. Amendments to the claims overcomes the previous objections to the claims and 35 USC § 101 rejection.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 7, and 10 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over United States Patent Application Publication 2004/0243944 A1 to Sabiers et al. (hereinafter Sabiers) in view of United States Patent 7,272,820 B2 to Klianev.

5. As to claim 1, Sabiers teaches the invention substantially as claimed including a method for presenting event associations between events from one or more event flows on a display screen of a computer (Figure 2), comprising:

constructing a sequence diagram representation (paragraphs [0046]-[0047]), wherein the sequence diagram representation comprises a top node associated with a machine or a process (paragraphs [0046]-[0047] and [0051]);

generating event pairs between the events from the one or more event flows (paragraph [0073]), wherein said sequence diagram representation comprises timelines for said event flows and directional paths between said timelines for said event associations (Figure 2, paragraphs [0047], [0071]-[0074]), and

wherein said sequence diagram representation comprises a higher level and a lower level (Figure 3, paragraphs [0051] and [0057]); and

displaying said sequence diagram representation on said display screen (Figure 2, paragraph [0039]).

Sabiers does not explicitly disclose wherein a user drills down from the top node associated with the higher level to the lower level in the sequence diagram representation to view the events.

However Klianev teaches wherein a user drills down from the top node associated with the higher level to the lower level in the sequence diagram representation to view the events (col. 23, lines 66-67 and col. 24, lines 1-2).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the Web Services Components representational

graphics of Sabiers with the teachings of Collections from Klianev because this feature would have provided a mechanism to model a hierarchy of class objects with capacity to represent variety of workflow configurations and associated structure of threads with capacity for concurrent processing of multitude of workflow requests (col. 10, lines 43-46 of Klianev) and wherein collections and individual objects are accessible via references controlled by objects belonging to collections from previous level (col. 10, lines 60-63 of Klianev).

6. As to claim 2, Sabiers as modified teaches the method of claim 1 further comprising providing a graphical user interface for selecting a level of detail for said sequence diagram representation (paragraph [0051] of Sabiers); and wherein the higher level and the lower level comprise at least one process level sequence diagram (col. 11, lines 5-6 of Klianev), at least one thread level sequence diagram (col. 11, lines 31-35 of Klianev), at least one class level sequence diagram (col. 10, lines 42-46 of Klianev), and at least one object level sequence diagram (col. 11, lines 13-18 of Klianev).

7. As to claim 3, Sabiers as modified teaches the method of claim 2, wherein content for said level of detail is established by a predetermined relationship model for said event flows (paragraph [0066] of Sabiers); responsive to the user clicking on the top node assigned to the machine or the process, linking to the lower level (col. 23, lines 66-67 and col. 24, lines 1-2 of Klianev).

8. As to claim 4, Sabiers teaches the method of claim 1 further comprising generating said event associations by selecting associated events from said event flows in accordance with one or more predetermined parameters (paragraph [0066]);

the sequence diagram representation presents event associations from multiple logs (paragraphs [0065]-[0066] and [0075]); and

non-associated events are excluded by filtering the non-associated events (paragraph [0066]).

9. As to claim 5, Sabiers teaches the method of claim 4 wherein said predetermined parameters include time of occurrence (paragraph [0038]).

10. As to claim 6, Sabiers teaches the method of claim 1 wherein said event flows are logs (paragraph [0075]).

11. As to claim 7, Sabiers teaches the method of claim 1 wherein said sequence diagram is a universal modeling language ("UML") sequence diagram (paragraph [0047]).

12. As to claim 8, Sabiers teaches the invention substantially as claimed including a system for presenting event associations between events from one or more event flows on a display screen (Figure 2), said system including memory and an input device (paragraph [0079]), said system comprising:

a processor coupled to said display, memory, and input device (paragraph [0079]) and adapted for:

constructing a sequence diagram representation (paragraphs [0046]-[0047])

wherein the sequence diagram representation comprises a top node associated with a machine or a process (paragraphs [0046]-[0047] and [0051]);

generating event pairs between the events from the one or more event flows (paragraph [0073]), wherein said sequence diagram representation comprises timelines for said event flows and directional paths between said timelines for said event associations Figure 2, paragraphs [0047], [0071]-[0074]), and

wherein said sequence diagram representation comprises a higher level and a lower level (Figure 3, paragraphs [0051] and [0057]); and

displaying said sequence diagram representation on said display screen (Figure 2, paragraph [0039]).

Sabiers does not explicitly disclose wherein a user drills down from the top node associated with the higher level to the lower level in the sequence diagram representation to view the events and the event pairs.

However Klianev teaches wherein a user drills down from the top node associated with the higher level to the lower level in the sequence diagram representation to view the events and the event pairs (col. 23, lines 66-67 and col. 24, lines 1-2).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the Web Services Components representational graphics of Sabiers with the teachings of Collections from Klianev because this feature would have provided a mechanism to model a hierarchy of class objects with capacity to

represent variety of workflow configurations and associated structure of threads with capacity for concurrent processing of multitude of workflow requests (col. 10, lines 43-46 of Klianev) and wherein collections and individual objects are accessible via references controlled by objects belonging to collections from previous level (col. 10, lines 60-63 of Klianev).

13. As to claims 9-14, these claims are rejected for the same reasons as claims 2-7 respectively, since claims 9-14 recite the same or equivalent invention, see the rejections to claims 2-7 above.

14. As to claims 15-21, these claims are rejected for the same reasons as claims 1-7 respectively, since claims 15-21 recite the same or equivalent invention, see the rejections to claims 1-7 above.

15. As to claims 22-28, these claims are rejected for the same reasons as claims 8-14 respectively, since claims 22-28 recite the same or equivalent invention, see the rejections to claims 8-14 above.

Conclusion

16. The prior art made of record on the accompanying PTO-892 and not relied upon, is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to KimbleAnn Verdi whose telephone number is (571) 270-1654. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 7:30am-5:00pm EST..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, William Thomson can be reached on (571) 272-3718. The fax phone

number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

December 21, 2007

KV



WILLIAM THOMSON
ADVISORY PATENT EXAMINER